REMARKS

Claims 1-30 are pending in this application. No amendments have been made to the claims.

Rejection of the Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 1-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as failing to distinctly claim the present invention. In the current Office Action, the Examiner is requiring that the Applicants submit only the relevant portions Bluetooth specification from the time of filing of the present application for entry into the file history in order to define the term "Bluetooth". (Page 2, line 17 through page 3, line 4 of the October 4, 2006 office action)

Applicants are including herewith relevant portions of the Core Specification of the Bluetooth System, Version 1.1, February 22, 2001, in order to overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejection of claims 1-30.

Portions submitted from the Core Specification of the Bluetooth System, Version 1.1, February 22, 2001, include: 1) the table of contents (pages 5-13 of 1084 pages); 2) the scope portion of the radio specification (page 19 of 1084); 3) the general description of the baseband specification (pages 41-42 of 1084); and 4) the definitions set forth in Appendix III (pages 921-922 of 1084). Other portions of the specification may also be relevant to the definition of "Bluetooth," however, Applicant believes that the enclosed portions of the specification are sufficient to give the term "Bluetooth" a fixed and definite meaning, as required by MPEP section 608.01(v). Applicant specifically points to the definition of "Bluetooth" given on page 921 of the specification: "Bluetooth is a wireless communication link, operating in the unlicensed ISM band at 2.4 GHz using a frequency hopping transceiver. It allows real-time

voice and data communications between Bluetooth Hosts. The link protocol is based on time slots."

Applicant has included portions of the Bluetooth Core Specification Version 2.0 + EDR, November 4, 2004, herewith as well. This is the currently available version of the specification as of January 4, 2007. Applicant points out that on page 15 of 92 in version 2.0 of the Bluetooth specification, the following definition is given for "Bluetooth": "Bluetooth is a wireless communication link, operating in the unlicensed ISM band at 2.4 GHz using a frequency hopping transceiver. It allows real-time AV and data communications between Bluetooth Hosts. The link protocol is based on time slots." This definition is substantially identical to that set forth in version 1.1 of the specification. Thus, Applicant believes that the definition of "Bluetooth" is not a definition that can change frequently, and is not indefinite, as asserted by the Examiner.

While Applicant continues to disagree with the Examiner's characterization of "Bluetooth" as indefinite, Applicant has submitted herewith the requested documentation in order to expedite allowance of the present application. Applicant thus respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Rejection of the Claims under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and 103(a)

Claims 1-4, 7, 18-21, 24, and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,647,497 to Cromer et al. ("Cromer"). Claims 5, 6, 8, 9, 22, and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cromer in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,609,656 to Elledge ("Elledge"). Claims 10-17 and 25-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cromer in view of Elledge in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,433,685 to Struble et al. ("Struble"). Claim 30 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cromer in view of Struble.

The Examiner indicated on page 3, lines 12-14 of the October 4, 2006 Office Action that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejections would be withdrawn when appropriate documentation was submitted to define "Bluetooth." Applicant has submitted such documentation herewith, and thus respectfully requests the withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 102(e) and 103(a) rejections based on the following previously submitted arguments:

Embodiments of the present invention take advantage of Bluetooth technology to create a security system where a secured device includes a communication system that allows it to communicate with a number of Bluetooth access points coupled to a security server. Claim 1 refers to the secured device as including a transceiver for sending and receiving data. Claims 18 and 29 indicate that the secured device is able to send and receive data via the Bluetooth technology. With such an equipped secured device, a plurality of Bluetooth Access Points may establish a Bluetooth link with the secured device and a security server that is connected to all BTAPs. Claim 1 calls for the security server to obtain attribute information, to activate a lock with the secured device, and to send location information of a designated BTAP and an unlock

code to the secured device via the designated BTAP. Claim 18 is a method claim that includes limitations similar to those found in claim 1. Claim 29 refers to a plurality of instructions stored on a computer readable medium to be executed by a processor of a security server to establish a link via a designated BTAP to obtain attribute information of the secured device, activate a lock with the secured device and sending location information of the designated BTAP and an unlock code to the secured device via the designated BTAP. Several features of these independent claims are not taught or suggested by the cited references.

Cromer fails to teach or suggest Bluetooth technology and fails to teach or suggest the communication link between the BTAPs and the secured device as recited in the pending claims. The laptop computers of Cromer are to receive wireless signals via the RFID interface (Col. 3, lines 44-47), but do not have any capability for transmitting data to any device that can be considered a BTAP as described in the pending claims. In addition, Applicant maintains all arguments made in previous Amendments.

Elledge and Struble fail to make up for the deficiencies of Cromer. Elledge concerns the receipt of signals from an RFID device attached to a laptop computer. Such a system is similar to the use of RFIDs in stores to prevent shoplifting. It is noted that the present application discusses the use of RFIDs in the Background section. Struble is similar to Elledge. Struble provides a computer with a database that receives information from a detector of identification information and checks it against its database records. When a match is found, owner preference information associated with the identification is retrieved from the database records and transmitted.

Since features of the claims are neither taught nor suggested by the Cromer, Elledge, and Struble references, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-30 under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and 103(a) is respectfully requested.

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees under 37 C.F.R. §1.16 or §1.17 or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0221.

If there are questions concerning this matter, please contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at (916) 356-5358.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 4, 2007

/Cyndi M. Wheeler/
Cyndi M. Wheeler
Registration No. 58,156

Intel Corporation
c/o Intellevate, LLC
P.O. Box 52050
Minneapolis, MN 55402